

Article

Discipled by the West?—The Influence of the Theology of Protestant Missionaries in China on Chinese Christianity through the Translation of the Chinese Union Version of the Bible

Chao-Chun Liu

School of Modern Languages and Cultures, Durham University, Durham DH1 3LE, UK;
chao-chun.liu@durham.ac.uk



Citation: Liu, Chao-Chun. 2021. Discipled by the West?—The Influence of the Theology of Protestant Missionaries in China on Chinese Christianity through the Translation of the Chinese Union Version of the Bible. *Religions* 12: 250. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12040250>

Academic Editor: Carlos F. Cardoza-Orlandi

Received: 30 January 2021
Accepted: 26 March 2021
Published: 1 April 2021

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright: © 2021 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Abstract: Over the last one hundred years, the Chinese Union Version of the Bible (CUV)—translated by Western Protestant missionaries—has enjoyed an unparalleled status as *the* Chinese Bible or the “Authorized Version” of the Chinese Bible. However, despite such towering significance, no scholarly works to date have systematically examined the influences of Protestant missionary theology on the translation of the CUV and, in turn, on Chinese Christianity. As an introductory attempt to explore this question, this paper first highlights this gap in current scholarship and the importance of filling this gap. Then, it presents four factors and two limitations in examining the theology of the CUV and conducts a case study on the theological topic of dichotomy versus trichotomy in the translation of the CUV along with four other Chinese Bible translations. After examining how the translators’ theology might have influenced these translations, it suggests how such influence through the translation of the CUV might have shaped Chinese Christianity both past and present, thereby demonstrating how the understanding of Chinese Christianity can be deepened by examining the relationships between missionaries’ theology, their Bible translations, and the development of Chinese Christianity.

Keywords: theology; Protestant missionaries; Bible translation; Chinese Christianity; the Union Version; China

1. Introduction: A Gap in Current Scholarship on Chinese Christianity

Since the 1980s, as a result of a paradigm shift in the field of Chinese studies, the indigenization of Christianity in China has increasingly become the focus of scholarship on Chinese Christianity in the English-speaking world (Ying 2005, pp. 204–10). Subsequently, studies on Chinese Christianity have gradually shifted from the earlier “western-centered” or “missionary-centered” approach to a “China-centered” one (Leung 2011, p. 58; Ng 2012), from the earlier focus on Western missionaries’ contribution to the modernization of China or their failure in implanting Christianity into the Chinese soil¹, to the presently dominant focus on Chinese Christians’ success in indigenizing Christianity for China. Thus, post-1949 Christianity in China has since then been portrayed primarily as an indigenized product of Chinese Christians distinct from that in the missionary era. However, although institutionally and administratively the influences of Western missionaries on Chinese Christianity ended around 1949², theologically and spiritually their influences have long survived their departure and continued to this day. One of the most powerful mediums of these lasting theological and spiritual influences is the Christian literature produced for or introduced to the Chinese by the missionaries, and among this body of literature the

¹ As Daniel H. Bays wrote, “In the 1960s and 1970s, it seemed to many, including me, that the historical verdict on the significance of Christianity in modern Chinese history was that for the most part it had been a false start, a failed endeavor” (Bays 1996, p. vii).

² In 1951, most missionaries were expelled from China by Mao Zedong (Leung 2010, p. 794).

Chinese Union Version of the Bible (henceforth, CUV)³ is undoubtedly the most influential and significant one in the development of Chinese Christianity since its publication in 1919 (Mak 2020; Chong 2000).

However, for two reasons, to assess the influences of the theology of Protestant missionaries on Chinese Christianity⁴ through the translation of the CUV is to step into an uncharted territory. First, even though a great number of studies on missionaries to China have been done in the past, how the theology of the missionaries in China has influenced the development of Chinese Christianity is still an underresearched area. For example, there is still not a one-volume survey of the theology of Protestant missionaries in China⁵, let alone a survey of its overall influences on Chinese Christianity. Nevertheless, the importance of studying the theology of missionaries and its influences on the native church has been noted by some scholars. As Christopher E. M. Wigram wrote, “Although most missionaries were not theologians making a contribution to theology as a discipline, they nevertheless operated with theological assumptions and arguably were to have a more enduring influence on the developing church world-wide than the ‘professional’ theologians” (Wigram 2007, p. 2). In the case of China, many important questions along this line are yet to be answered, such as, how has the theology of the missionaries shaped the development of Chinese Christianity? What elements in the development of Chinese Christianity are authentically “indigenous” and what are heritage from the West? In this intercultural transmission of faith, what theological elements have faded over time and what have proved long-lasting? This paper can only present one way of addressing some of these questions. Second, even though it has been generally recognized by scholars that Bible translation is “a theological task from beginning to end—from interpretation to choice of word and phrase” (Ogden 2002, p. 316)⁶, and even though many studies have been done on Chinese Bible translation (henceforth, CBT) and specifically on the CUV, overall the influences of the translators’ theology on both CBT and the CUV is still an underresearched area.⁷ As William Tyndale was not only a translator but a theologian who “exerted considerable influence over English vernacular theology as well as on the theology of the English Bibles that followed his own translations” (James 2011, p. 2), many of the missionary translators of the Chinese Bibles in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries had functioned in similar ways, but how their theology has shaped the theology of subsequent Chinese Bibles and thereby influenced the development of Chinese Christianity

³ The complete Union Version was published in 1919 in two language versions (Wenli and Mandarin versions), but it was the Mandarin version that became widely popular and will be the subject of this paper. Hence, the term *Chinese Union Version* or *CUV* in this paper will only refer to the Mandarin version.

⁴ This paper will only consider Protestant missionary theology, and thus when “Chinese Christianity” is mentioned, it mainly refers to the Protestant part of it.

⁵ The only work that comes close to a general survey of the theology of the Protestant missionaries in China is M. Searle Bates’ 1974 article titled “The Theology of American Missionaries in China, 1900–1950” (Bates 1974). Lian Xi’s *The Conversion of Missionaries* (Lian 1997) explored the rise of liberal theology among the missionaries in China from 1907 to 1932, and Kevin Xiyi Yao’s *The Fundamentalist Movement among Protestant Missionaries in China, 1920–1937* (Yao 2003) presented the other side of the story in the fundamentalist-liberal conflict. There are many other works that discuss the theology of individual missionaries, such as Andrew T. Kaiser’s work on Timothy Richard (Kaiser 2019) and Christopher E. M. Wigram’s work on Hudson Taylor (Wigram 2007). But none of these present a comprehensive view of the theology of the Protestant missionaries in China. Admittedly, the great diversity of theological backgrounds of Protestant missionaries in China will require the expert knowledge of all the theological traditions represented to write a comprehensive survey and is thus a challenging task for scholars on Chinese Christianity in general.

⁶ Ernst Wendland also wrote: “The activity of Bible translation inevitably involves the translators in a significant and sustained act of ‘theologizing.’ It is not a question of ‘if’ but ‘when’—more specifically, how, where, and why . . . This principle holds true no matter what type or style of version is being prepared, from the most literal . . . to a highly idiomatic recreation in a contemporary language” (Wendland 2002, p. 316). As such, Chinese Bible translations done by the missionaries provide a particularly useful window through which the theology of these missionaries can be examined. For how Bible translation is inevitably shaped by the translators’ theology, also see (Blumczynski 2006).

⁷ Of all the works done on CBT and the CUV so far, most have focused on the historical, cultural, sociological, literary, and linguistic aspects of the translation, and only a few have touched on the influences of the translators’ theology on the translation, such as (Strandenaes 1987) and (Tong 2018). Admittedly a good amount of works have been devoted to the Term Question which is highly theological, but that only covers the question of the name of God (and the Holy Spirit) and is far from sufficient to cover the colossal subject of the influences of the translators’ theology on CBT and the CUV.

has remained mostly unexamined.⁸ The following sections will present a case study of one such theological influence in the making of the CUV, as an example of how other influences might likewise be examined. Besides introducing the importance of a new research field combining theology, mission history, and Bible translation in the study of Chinese Christianity, this paper hopes to contribute to the larger argument that the history of Christianity cannot be studied in isolation from the history of Christian mission and the history of theology.

2. Examining the Theology of the CUV's Translators: Four Factors and Two Limitations

For any examination of the theology of the CUV or of its translators, four factors should be noted. First, as the Bible version commissioned by the historic 1890 missionary conference, translated by a committee of eleven translators (just for its New Testament portion), and designed to become the standard version for all Protestant Christians in China, the theology of the CUV, as its name *Union Version* indicated, is necessarily “ecumenical” in nature in order to gain the support of all Protestant missionaries and societies. As such, the CUV is arguably the Bible translation that best embodies and represents the general theological consensus among the Protestant missionaries in China from the late nineteenth to the early twentieth century. This ecumenical nature of the theology of the CUV is reflected in Bates’ analysis of the theology of American missionaries in China in the early twentieth century, as he chose “accommodation and unity” for its general description (Bates 1974, p. 138). Therefore, the theology of the CUV should be considered as more a reflection of the collective theology of the Protestant missionaries at the time rather than that of the personal theologies of the translators.

Second, there were other factors that were “restraints on missionaries in their natural tendency to import Western theologies under established labels” (ibid, p. 142). Besides the strong yearning to unite, another factor that modified the theologies from abroad was “the need and will to simplify,” for Chinese society was unfamiliar with Christianity and largely unlettered at the time, and to “preach, teach, and print the central simplicities, always for Chinese eyes and ears . . . were essential guidelines” (ibid, pp. 141–42). Thus, accommodation for unity and simplification for easy understanding and evangelism were two modifying factors that govern the theology of the CUV.

Third, starting from Walter Henry Medhurst’s effort to revise Robert Morrison’s monumental Bible translation of 1823, there began a strong trend among missionaries to indigenize or Sinicize Bible translation to produce a more paraphrastic and Chinese-sounding translation that would be easier to be understood by the Chinese (Zetzsche 1999, pp. 59–75; Tong 2018, p. 74 ff). Over the course of the nineteenth century, this trend was strengthened as prominent figures such as James Legge worked to reverse the earlier missionary attitude from viewing Chinese traditional religious elements as anti-Christian or demonic to viewing some of them as part of genuine divine revelation and harbinger to Christianity (Legge 1852; Eber 1999, pp. 144–47; Lian 1997, pp. 172–73). Although this trend was always met with resistance from those with a more conservative theological outlook, it has nevertheless seeped into Bible translations and produced many Biblical terms that originated from Chinese culture and religions⁹. This indigenizing tendency is further strengthened as the missionary translators’ Chinese assistants¹⁰, who knew nothing about Biblical Greek and very little if anything about theology but were steeped in Chinese classics, gained a more prominent role in the translation of the CUV and later even

⁸ Besides studies on the Term Question and the translation of the word *baptism* (Zetzsche 1999, pp. 54–57), the only work that has substantially dealt with certain theological aspects of Chinese Bible translation is Robert Menzies’ *The Language of the Spirit* (Menzies 2010). Hui Er Yu’s work (Yu 2018) is limited in both its coverage (only concerning the translation of one word) and theological depth.

⁹ Examples of this can be seen in the debates surrounding the Term Question (Eber 1999) and the Westerners’ attitude toward Daoism (Walf 1999).

¹⁰ These assistants include: Wang Yuande 王元德, Cheng Jingyi 誠靜怡, Zou Liwen 鄒立文, Zhang Xixin 張洗心, Li Chunfan 李春蕃, and Liu Dacheng 劉大成 (Zetzsche 2000, pp. 10–15).

shared the equal right to vote as missionary translators in making decisions regarding the translation (Strandenaes 2006, p. 143).

Fourth, as Robert Menzies (2010, p. 10) noted, the three main translators of the New Testament portion of the CUV—Calvin Wilson Mateer, Chauncey Goodrich, and Frederick William Baller¹¹—were all steeped in the Reformed tradition. In fact, out of the eleven translators who had ever worked on the New Testament portion of the CUV, at least seven of them clearly came from Reformed theological backgrounds.¹² Moreover, it has been suggested that the general vocabulary of the CUV is inherited from the Delegates' Version (New Testament portion published in 1852)¹³ and the Peking Version (published in 1872) (Strandenaes 1987, p. 88), and all the translators of both of these earlier versions were again closely associated with the Reformed tradition.¹⁴ Even the translator of the first Protestant version of the New Testament in Chinese (published in 1813), Robert Morrison, who also authored the first Chinese-English, English-Chinese dictionary (1815–1823)¹⁵, came from the Reformed tradition (London Missionary Society). Admittedly, a person's theology may not fully match that of his or her mission society. However, this overwhelmingly dominant Reformed theological profile of the translators, although very likely constrained and modified by the three previous factors, is still significant and should not be overlooked in examining the theology of the CUV and of its translators.

Two limitations in such an examination should also be noted. First, any claim of identifying influences of translators' theology on Bible translation can only be an interpretation and not a fact unless writings of the translators themselves that reveal their theological reasoning in the translation process can be found. In the case of the CUV's translators, only a small amount of such writings have been found so far¹⁶. Second, it has been suggested that the translators of the CUV had so heavily relied on the Peking Version that the CUV should be considered more as a revision of the Peking Version (Tong 2019). Therefore, a rendering in the CUV that seems to be a deliberate theological choice of the translators might just be the result of their following the Peking Version (or other earlier versions). Nevertheless, in that case, it should also mean that the CUV's translators at least agreed with the theological choice of those earlier translators, and this may actually strengthen the link between the Reformed tradition and the CUV's translation, for both the CUV's and the Peking Version's translators were mostly associated with the Reformed tradition. This also makes the CUV an even more representative version reflecting the theology of the Protestant missionaries in China from the 1870s or even the 1850s into the early twentieth century.

This paper will mainly examine the New Testament portion partially because of the limited space allowed and partially because the subject of the case study (dichotomy versus

¹¹ Mateer was a Presbyterian, Goodrich a Congregationalist, and Baller a Baptist. Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and most Baptists are Reformed in their theological orientation, and this assumption about their theological leaning was somewhat substantiated by Menzies' analysis of their translation (Menzies 2010). Of course, a translator from a Reformed (or any other theological) background does not necessarily mean that he or she subscribes to every doctrinal point of that tradition. Thus, the discussion here is simply to point to the fact that the overall, dominant theological background of these missionary translators is the Reformed tradition.

¹² Besides the three main translators, these were Henry Blodget (American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions), George Sidney Owen (London Missionary Society), John Livingston Nevius (American Presbyterian Mission), and Henry McKee Woods (American Southern Presbyterian Mission). All these mission societies were parts of the Reformed tradition.

¹³ This Delegates' New Testament Version was the most widely published New Testament version in Chinese in the nineteenth century (Strandenaes 1987, p. 48).

¹⁴ The translators of the New Testament portion of the Delegates' Version were William Jones Boone (American Episcopal Missionary Society); Walter Henry Medhurst, William Charles Milne, and John Stronach (London Missionary Society); and Elijah Coleman Bridgman (American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions) (Strandenaes 1987, p. 48). The translators of the Peking Version were John Shaw Burdon (Church Missionary Society), Samuel Isaac Joseph Schereschewsky (American Episcopal Church Mission), Henry Blodget (American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions), Joseph Edkins (London Missionary Society), and William Alexander Parsons Martin (American Presbyterian) (Zetzsche 1999, pp. 145–46). All these affiliations were also closely associated with the Reformed tradition. For the dominance of the Reformed theological tradition among the Protestant missionaries in China, also see (Chow 2018, pp. 97–98).

¹⁵ How the theology of Morrison might have influenced the dictionaries he produced and his Bible translation as well as later translations of the Bible is another subject worthy of study.

¹⁶ Including Mateer's articles on the Term Questions (Mateer 1901, 1902), and Baller's "Notes on the Revision of the Mandarin New Testament" (Baller 1907b).

trichotomy) examined is mainly a New Testament theological issue, for verses commonly cited to support either dichotomy or trichotomy are primarily from the New Testament (Erickson 2013, pp. 477–80). Therefore, from here on the term *the CUV* will mostly refer to the New Testament part of the translation.

3. Case Study: Dichotomy Versus Trichotomy

The Greek words πνεῦμα (*pneuma*) and ψυχή (*psuche*) in reference to human constitution are commonly translated as *spirit* and *soul* in the New Testament. The treatment of these two Greek words by Bible translators—as they relate to human makeup—clearly reflects the translators’ position between two traditional Christian views of human constitution as either composed of body and soul (a.k.a. dichotomy) or composed of body, soul, and spirit (a.k.a. trichotomy). The key difference between these two views lies in whether soul and spirit are basically synonymous or distinct parts of human constitution, and both of these views have a long theological tradition dated back to antiquity and the early church fathers (Erickson 2013, pp. 477–93).¹⁷ On this theological subject of human constitution being either dichotomous or trichotomous according to the Bible, the CUV’s translation clearly falls in line with earlier Chinese Bible translations and shows the general theological consensus on this issue in favor of the dichotomous view among these missionary translators in nineteenth-century China.

Table 1¹⁸ below presents a comprehensive comparison of how the Greek word *pneuma* (*spirit*) in reference to human constitution¹⁹ in the four Gospels is translated in Robert Morrison’s translation (M)²⁰, the Delegates’ Version (DV), the Peking Version (PV), the Chinese Union Version (CUV), the Chinese Recovery Version (CRV), the King James Version (KJV), and the (English) Revised Version (RV, published in 1881). Appendix A presents the same comparison for the rest of the New Testament, and Appendices B and C present the same comparisons for the Greek word *psuche* (*soul*) and the adjective forms of both *pneuma* and *psuche* in the New Testament, respectively. These three versions—the M, DV, and PV—are chosen besides the CUV because they are arguably the most influential Chinese Bible translations in the nineteenth century, and as such are tremendously helpful in shedding light on the overall theological consensus among the Protestant missionaries. The CRV (published in 1987) is chosen because its main translator Witness Lee (1905–1997) and his spiritual mentor Watchman Nee (1903–1972) are well-known trichotomists whose trichotomous view is clearly reflected in their Bible translation, which provides a stark contrast to the other Chinese versions listed here, as these earlier versions to varying degrees all reflect a dichotomous view, which is also the dominant view in the Reformed tradition. The KJV and the RV are chosen because they are the two English base texts of the CUV (Mak 2010) and the KJV was the most authoritative English version prior to the RV and should have exerted considerable influence over all these Chinese Bible translations. Therefore, any rendering in these Chinese translations that differs from the KJV’s rendering (and any rendering in the CUV that differs from both the KJV’s and RV’s renderings) would particularly shed light on the translators’ understanding of *pneuma* and *psuche* in reference to human constitution.

¹⁷ As in all other theological subjects, there are also variations of beliefs within each of these traditions, which will not be discussed here.

¹⁸ All the tables in this paper were produced with the help of the FHL website (<https://bible.fhl.net/> accessed on 15 January 2021). Morrison’s version, the Delegates’ Version, and the Peking Version all used Textus Receptus as their base texts, whereas the CUV used both Textus Receptus (Scrivener 1882) and the base text of the Revised Version (Palmer 1881; see Strandenaes 1987, pp. 81–83) as its base text. The base text of the Chinese Recovery Version is the Nestle–Aland Novum Testamentum Graece (26th edition). These Greek texts have been examined and in most cases found to play no role in the different renderings presented in the tables in this paper.

¹⁹ Verses where *pneuma* is universally interpreted as the Holy Spirit are generally not included here. Admittedly, in many verses it is hard to tell whether the word is referring to human spirit or the divine Spirit (or both), and one’s judgment in each case is inevitably influenced by his or her belief whether man is dichotomous or trichotomous. For example, dichotomists often understand expressions such as “according to the spirit” (Rom. 8:4–5) or “in spirit” (Eph. 2:22; 3:5; 5:18; 6:18) in the New Testament as referring to the Holy Spirit, whereas trichotomists often understand them as referring to the human spirit. Also see (Menzies 2010, pp. 25–39).

²⁰ The New Testament portion of Morrison’s translation was published in 1813; his translation of the entire Bible was published in 1823.

Table 1. The translation of *pneuma* (spirit) in the four Gospels.

	M (1813/1823)	DV (1852)	PV (1872)	CUV (1919)	CRV (1987)	KJV/RV
Matt. 5:3	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
Matt. 22:43	<i>shenfeng</i> 神風 (Holy Spirit)	<i>shengshen</i> 聖神 (Holy Spirit)	<i>shengling</i> 聖靈 (Holy Spirit)	<i>shengling</i> 聖靈 (Holy Spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit/Spirit
Matt. 26:41	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xinling</i> 心靈 (mind, heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
Matt. 27:50	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	<i>qi</i> 氣 (breath)	<i>qi</i> 氣 (breath)	<i>qi</i> 氣 (breath)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	ghost/spirit
Mark 2:8	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	omitted	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
Mark 8:12	omitted	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
Mark 14:38	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xinling</i> 心 靈(mind, heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
Luke 1:17	<i>shen</i> 神 (spirit)	<i>qingxing</i> 情性 (disposition)	<i>xinzhi</i> 心志 (will)	<i>xinzhi</i> 心志 (will)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
Luke 1:47	<i>shen</i> 神 (spirit)	<i>shen</i> 神 (spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
Luke 1:80	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>jingshen</i> 精神 (spirit, mind, vigor)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xinling</i> 心靈 (mind, heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
Luke 8:55	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>shen</i> 神 (spirit)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
Luke 9:55	<i>xingqing</i> 性 情(disposition)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit/NA ²¹
Luke 23:46	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>shen</i> 神 (spirit)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
John 3:6	<i>lingshen</i> 靈神 (intelligent spirit) ²²	<i>shen</i> 神 (spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
John 4:23-24	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>shen</i> 神 (spirit)	<i>xingling</i> 性靈 (disposition)	<i>xinling</i> 心靈 (mind, heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
John 11:33	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
John 13:21	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
John 19:30	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>qi</i> 氣 (breath)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	ghost/spirit

An analysis of Table 1 and Appendices A and B reveal many indicators of the translators' theological position on dichotomy versus trichotomy. First, in a total of 78 verses (19 verses in the Gospels and 59 in the rest of the New Testament), the CRV consistently translated the word *pneuma* (spirit) in reference to human constitution²³ as *ling* 靈 (spirit). Both the KJV and the RV (and the later American Standard Version as well) also consistently translated the word *pneuma* as *spirit*, referring to the human spirit, and occasionally as *Spirit*, referring to the Spirit of God.²⁴ Similarly, in a total of 36 verses, the CRV consistently translated the word *psuche* (soul) as *hun* 魂 (soul), and both the KJV and the RV again also consistently translated *psuche* as *soul*. This shows that the CRV's treatment of the word *pneuma* and *psuche* is basically the same as the KJV's and the RV's, which is to consistently render *pneuma* and *psuche* by the same words, as *spirit* and *soul*, respectively, thereby maintaining the clear distinction between these two words in the original. This is clearly a theological choice by the CRV's translators because, being trichotomists, they hope to preserve and convey the distinction between spirit and soul as much as possible.

In sharp contrast to the translators of the CRV, the KJV, and the RV, the translators of the M, DV, PV, and CUV generally did not consider it necessary to maintain the aforementioned distinction and instead often translated them interchangeably and into a variety

²¹ RV omitted the verse "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of" in the KJV.

²² This definition is taken from Morrison's own dictionary (Morrison 1815a, p. 61).

²³ From here on, all discussions concerning *pneuma* and *psuche* are only limited to their usage in reference to human constitution.

²⁴ See note 19.

of other words without a clear distinction between the two, as shown in Table 2 below. This dichotomous approach²⁵ matches the dichotomous view dominant in the Reformed tradition, from which most of these translators came.

Table 2. Number of verses in which various Chinese words were used to translate *pneuma* in reference to human constitution in the New Testament.

	M (1823)	DV (1852)	PV (1872)	CUV (1919)	CRV (1987)
<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	23	0	9	13	78
<i>lingshen</i> 靈神 (intelligent spirit)	2	0	0	0	0
<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	5	0	0	0	0
<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	14	22	33	27	0
<i>xinling</i> 心靈 (mind, heart)	0	0	0	11	0
<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	4	1	11	9	0
<i>shenfeng</i> 神風/ <i>shengfeng</i> 聖風/ <i>shengshen</i> 聖神/ <i>shengling</i> 聖靈 (Holy Spirit)	4/1/2/0	0/0/9/0	0/0/0/15	0/0/0/12	0
<i>feng</i> 風 (Spirit/spirit)	15	0	0	0	0
<i>shen</i> 神 (Spirit/spirit)	4	29	0	0	0
<i>xingqing</i> 性情/ <i>pingqi</i> 品氣/ <i>qingxing</i> 情性 (disposition)	1/1/0	0/0/1	1/0/0	0	0
<i>xingling</i> 性靈 (disposition, intelligence, personality)	0	0	3	0	0
<i>lingxing</i> 靈性 (spiritual nature)	0	0	0	1	0
<i>xingzhi</i> 心志/ <i>zhi</i> 志 (will)	0	2/2	1/0	2/1	0
<i>jingsheng</i> 精神 (spirit, mind, vigor)	0	1	0	0	0
<i>qi</i> 氣 (breath)	0	2	2	1	0
<i>yi</i> 意 (manner)	0	1	0	0	0
<i>wuxing</i> 無形 (invisible)	0	1	0	0	0
omitted	1	6	2	1	0
N/A	1	1	1	0	0

The table above reveals how the translators of these five versions interpreted the word *pneuma* in the New Testament differently from one another and especially from the CRV. In Morrison's version, the word *pneuma* is translated²⁶ as *ling* 靈 (spirit) in 23 verses, *feng* 風 (Spirit/spirit)²⁷ in 15 verses, *shen* 神 (Spirit/spirit)²⁸ in 4 verses, and *lingshen* 靈神 (intelligent spirit)²⁹ in 2 verses. While it is often hard to tell whether *feng* 風 and *shen* 神 in Morrison's usage refer to the Spirit of God or the spirit of man, he was more conservative than the translators of DV, PV, and CUV in that he more often translated *pneuma* into Chinese words that are capable of meaning *spirit*, thus displaying a higher regard for conveying the literal meaning of the Greek word. However, according to Morrison's Chinese-English dictionary in 1815³⁰, *ling* 靈 (spirit) in reference to man does

²⁵ There may be a variety of reasons that influence any translation choice, and one's theology is only one possible reason among many. But the fact remains that these translators generally did not consider it necessary to maintain the distinction between *pneuma* and *psuche*, and as a result, their translations fall in line with the dichotomous tradition (which views soul, spirit, heart, and mind more or less as synonymous). Therefore, while it is impossible to determine whether these translators were actually driven by a dichotomous view while translating unless they have left behind writings that stated so (which few translators would do), their translations nevertheless clearly reflect a dichotomous view. Thus, the term "dichotomous approach" here should be understood more as a description of the translation product than that of the translation process.

²⁶ While Morrison relied heavily on the Basset manuscript for his translation and only claimed thirteen out of the twenty-seven books of the New Testament as his own work, he nevertheless edited through the entire New Testament and made what he considered necessary changes (Daily 2013, p. 145).

²⁷ According to Morrison's dictionary (Morrison 1815b, p. 189).

²⁸ According to Morrison's dictionary (Morrison 1815b, p. 749).

²⁹ According to Morrison's dictionary (Morrison 1815a, p. 61).

³⁰ Morrison's dictionary in 1815 can shed light on his translation of the Bible because it was done during the same period and provides a clear view of his understanding of the Chinese language.

not mean a constituting part of human being but that which is spiritual, intelligent³¹, or good, felicitous, and efficacious (Morrison 1815b, p. 553), while *shen* 神, which could mean “the human spirit” (ibid, p. 749), was used only in 4 verses to translate *pneuma* in the whole New Testament. Moreover, while both *hun* 魂 and *linghun* 靈魂 mean “soul” and *xin* 心 means “heart” (ibid, pp. 308, 553, 771), all these three Chinese terms were used by Morrison to translate *pneuma* in 23 verses (out of 78 verses); conversely, as Appendix B shows, he also used the word *ling* 靈 (spirit), *feng* 風 (spirit), and *lingshen* 靈神 (intelligent spirit) to translate *psuche* (soul) in 8 verses (out of 35 verses). Furthermore, *linghun* 靈魂 (soul) and *xin* 心 (heart) were both used to translate *pneuma* (in 18 verses) and *psuche* (in 20 verses). All of these indicate that to Morrison, *soul*, *heart*, and *spirit* are all highly interchangeable words and do not refer to distinct parts of human being. Most significantly, in 1 Thessalonians 5:23, the most foundational verse supporting trichotomy, Morrison rendered *pneuma* (spirit) as *linghun* 靈魂 (soul) and rendered *psuche* (soul) as *feng* 風 (spirit), effectively identifying spirit and soul as the same entity.³² This again strongly indicates that to Morrison, *spirit* and *soul* are interchangeable words and thus, he was most likely a dichotomist. Curiously, a survey through the Bible commentaries he consulted while translating the Bible (Daily 2013, p. 146) shows that James Macknight, Philip Doddridge, and Adam Clarke whose works he consulted for translating the New Testament were all trichotomists. This shows that Morrison’s dichotomous treatment of *pneuma* and *psuche* might be, among other reasons, due to his own theological conviction formed prior to the translation project. In any case, his theological view on human constitution certainly played a role in his rendering of *pneuma* and *psuche* in his Bible translation.

Similarly, the translators of the DV, PV, and CUV are most likely dichotomists³³, for their translations also do not clearly distinguish between *pneuma* and *psuche* as different parts of human constitution. In the DV, PV, and CUV, *pneuma* is often translated as *xin* 心 (heart), which is often used to translate *psuche*. The PV and CUV both most often translated *pneuma* as *xin* 心 or *xinling* 心靈 (heart) and *linghun* 靈魂 (soul), clearly indicating that their translators consider spirit, soul, and heart as basically synonymous. Now, in the case of the CUV, this translational decision is most striking, for in the eighteen principles of translation announced by the translation committee for the translation of the CUV, three of them explicitly say:

1. Passages expressed in the same terms and in the same or similar connection in the original, translate in the uniform manner.
2. Translate Greek and Hebrew words occurring in different places and used in the same sense by the same Chinese words. . . .
11. Make a special effort to render literally words and phrases which have a theological or ethical importance, and which are, or may be, used by any school for proof or support of doctrines; putting explanations in the margin, if necessary. (Hykes 1892, pp. 26–27)

Yet, the CUV’s translators clearly did not keep these principles. They did not translate *pneuma* and *psuche* when referring to human constitution “in the uniform manner” and “by the same Chinese words,” and apparently did not consider the doctrine of trichotomy theologically important enough to retain the distinction between *pneuma* and *psuche*, even going against the authoritative translational tradition of the KJV (and the RV) which always

³¹ According to Morrison’s dictionary, man’s soul is expressed by the word *hun* 魂 (Morrison 1815a, p. 61), and *linghun* 靈魂 means “the intelligent soul” (ibid.), implying that *ling* 靈 simply means “intelligent.” This interpretation is further strengthened by his defining *shen* 神 as “the human spirit” and *lingshen* 靈神 as “the intelligent spirit” in man (Morrison 1815b, p. 749; 1815a, p. 61). This understanding of *ling* 靈 as “intelligent” matches the classic dichotomous definition of the spirit as the rational part of the soul.

³² It might be possible that Morrison here purposely reversed the order of the original wording from *spirit and soul* to *soul and spirit*, but there is no clear evidence to support this.

³³ The DV never used *ling* 靈 (spirit) to translate *pneuma* (spirit)—a remarkable rejection of the use of the term and a significant departure from Morrison’s translation. The DV used *shen* 神 (Spirit/spirit) in 29 verses to translate *pneuma*, but *shen* 神 could also mean the Spirit of God or even God to some of the translators of the DV (Tong 2018, pp. 149–50). Moreover, the DV also omitted the translation of *pneuma* (spirit) in six verses, more than all other versions. Thus, it is unlikely that the translators of the DV are trichotomists.

retains such distinction. The same dichotomous approach can be observed also in the translation of some key Old Testament verses related to human constitution, as Table 3 below shows. In Genesis 2:7, what was translated as *soul* (נֶפֶשׁ, *nephesh* in Hebrew) in the KJV and the RV was translated as *youlingderen* 有靈的人 (man with a spirit) in the CUV. In Genesis 41:8, what was translated as *spirit* (רוּחַ, *ruach* in Hebrew) in the KJV and the RV was translated as *xin* 心 (heart) in the CUV. In Psalm 42:6, what was translated as *soul* (*nephesh*) in the KJV and the RV was translated again as *xin* 心 (heart) in the CUV. In contrast, the CRV's renderings, like the examples shown before, always translated what was *spirit* in the KJV/RV as *ling* 靈 (spirit) and what was *soul* in the KJV/RV as *hun* 魂 (soul). The contrast between the CUV and the CRV once again became clear: the CUV with its dichotomous approach did not consider it important to maintain the distinction between *spirit* and *soul*, while the CRV almost always preserved this distinction.

Table 3. The translation of *ruach* (spirit) and *nephesh* (soul) in the Old Testament.

	M (1823)	DV (1854)	PV (1874) ³⁴	CUV (1919)	CRV (2003)	KJV/RV
Gen. 2:7	<i>huoling</i> 活靈 (living spirit)	<i>xieqizhiren</i> 血氣 之人 (natural man)	<i>youlinghundehuoeren</i> 有靈魂的活人 (living man with a soul)	<i>youlingdehuoeren</i> 有靈的活人 (living man with a spirit)	<i>huohun</i> 活魂 (living soul)	living soul (<i>nephesh</i>)
Gen. 41:8	<i>shen</i> 神 (Spirit/spirit)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit (<i>ruach</i>)
Psa. 42:6	<i>lingxin</i> 靈心 (spirit-heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	soul (<i>nephesh</i>)

This dichotomous approach of the CUV's translators becomes more intriguing in light of the fact that two Bible commentaries assigned to them for their translation work (Mak 2010, pp. 97–98) were both written by trichotomists, i.e., Ellicott (1897, p. 146) and Meyer (Lünemann 1884, pp. 163–64), whose trichotomous views were clearly shown in their commentaries.³⁵ This shows that, similar to Morrison, on this issue of dichotomy versus trichotomy the translators of the CUV were following more their own theological conviction rather than the theological position of the Bible commentaries officially assigned to them by the sponsoring organization or overseeing committee of their translation work. By translating *pneuma* as *heart* (*xin* 心 or *xinling* 心靈) and *soul* (*linghun* 靈魂), the translators of the CUV also departed from the standard Chinese word given for the translation of *pneuma* in this New Testament usage in the early twentieth century, roughly when the CUV was in the making: In John Leighton Stuart's *Greek-Chinese-English Dictionary of the New Testament* (Stuart 1918), the first of its kind in Chinese history, πνεῦμα (*pneuma*) is defined as *feng* 風 (wind), *qi* 氣 (breath), and *ling* 靈 (spirit), and πνευματικός (*pneumatikos*) is defined as *shulingde* 屬靈的 (spiritual) (ibid, p. 163). In *An Analytical Vocabulary of the New Testament* authored by F. W. Baller, one of the main translators and revisers of the CUV, *ling* 靈 is clearly defined as “spirit”; *hun* 魂 or *linghun* 靈魂, as “soul”; and *xin* 心, as “heart” (Baller 1907a, pp. 359, 374, 119). Yet, he and other translators of the CUV would still use *linghun* 靈魂 (soul) and *xin* 心 (heart) to translate *pneuma*, again indicating that to them, spirit, soul, and heart are all basically synonymous—a typical dichotomous view.

Three factors should be noted about the CUV's dichotomous view. First, as mentioned earlier, since the CUV was designed to be the common version used by all Protestant missionaries and Christians in China at the time, it is most likely that the CUV's dichotomous view reflects not just the theological position of the translators but also that of the majority of the Protestant missionaries at the time. This is confirmed by the examination of another important yet hitherto mostly neglected resource—*The Conference Commentary on the New Testament* commissioned also by the 1890 missionary conference (Woodbridge 1898). An

³⁴ This is the Old Testament version translated by Samuel I. J. Schereschewsky.

³⁵ It should be noted that Thayer's lexicon, which was also assigned to the CUV's translators for their translation work, defined *pneuma* as capable of being both synonymous with *soul* and distinct from it (Thayer 1889, p. 520).

examination of this *Conference Commentary* (first published in 1898), which was designed to be a “union commentary” (ibid, p. 355) similar to the “union Bible” and was even hailed by some as “the greatest work ever undertaken by the missionaries in China,”³⁶ shows that its position on human constitution is also dichotomous.³⁷ Second, the CUV’s dichotomous view is likely also strengthened by the Chinese assistants of the translators, for the dichotomous view of human constitution is also a popular view among the Chinese, and the trichotomy of spirit, soul, and body is generally a foreign concept to Chinese culture.³⁸ Third, as the CUV was produced by missionaries whose main concern was evangelization rather than theological precision, it is understandable that the CUV’s translators would prefer to produce an indigenized version that is easy to understand for the Chinese readers (Chan 2017, pp. 95–97). However, considering the Reformed theological background of the CUV’s translators and the prominence of the dichotomous view in that tradition, while CUV’s dichotomous translational approach could possibly have been influenced by the aforementioned factors, it is highly unlikely that the theological position of the missionary translators themselves did not play a major role also in this translational decision.

4. Influences of the CUV’s Dichotomous Position on Chinese Christianity

The above analysis indicates that despite their outward differences in terms of language style and terminology, these four most influential Chinese Bible translations (M, DV, PV, and CUV) over the last two hundred years since Protestantism came to China are essentially the same in taking the dichotomous position on the theological subject of dichotomy versus trichotomy. As a result, Chinese Christians who read these versions without a prior understanding of the theological traditions of dichotomy versus trichotomy and without the ability to read the Bible in English and in the original Greek have been unconsciously indoctrinated with the doctrine of dichotomy through these Bible translations. At the very least, they were not able to tell the distinction between *pneuma* and *psuche* in reference to human constitution through these Bible translations. Thus, in 1925, only six years after the CUV was published, Watchman Nee, who was to become one of the most influential Chinese Christians in the twentieth century, wrote:

Because the versions of the Bible we ordinarily use [referring to the CUV] do not follow a literal translation of the words “spirit” and “soul” in a strict way, readers find it difficult to differentiate between the two just by looking at the translated words. In translating the Bible, we should translate these words literally. When men in the world translate books, they invent many new terms. Why cannot the translation of the most widely circulated Book do the same? Since God has used two different terms for the spirit and the soul, we should not confuse them. (Nee 1992a, p. 5)

Similarly, in addressing the CUV’s tendency to add the word *holy* to the word *spirit*, which is also often done in the previous three Chinese versions to turn what might be a reference to the human spirit to a reference to the Holy Spirit—a typical dichotomous interpretation³⁹—Nee wrote:

In the Chinese Union Version of the Bible, it is difficult for us to tell when the word spirit refers to the Holy Spirit and when it refers to the human spirit. According to the translators of the Bible, whenever the original text used only the word spirit and not the Holy Spirit, they thought it actually referred to the Holy Spirit, and they added the word Holy before the word Spirit to indicate that it referred

³⁶ In the *Eighty-First Annual Report of the American Tract Society* (American Tract Society 1906, p. 180).

³⁷ The word *pneuma* is often translated as *linghun* 靈魂 (soul), *xin* 心 (heart), or *shengling* 聖靈 (Holy Spirit) throughout this commentary (Parker et al. 1899, 1907), and in 1 Thessalonians 5:23, the commentator specifically added *xin* 心 (heart) into the list of spirit, soul, and body, and did not mention anything about trichotomy.

³⁸ In the Chinese language the term *linghun* 靈魂, which literally means “spirit-soul,” is the common term for *soul*, and *ling* 靈 (spirit) and *hun* 魂 (soul) also share the basic definition of “soul.” For the significant role of Chinese assistants in the translation of the CUV, see (Zetzsche 2000; Strandenaes 2006; You 2007.)

³⁹ See note 19.

to the Holy Spirit . . . the word holy which is before the word Spirit, in some cases in the New Testament, *is really the translator's interpretation rather than his translation*. Whenever we come across this kind of situation, although we dare not think that it only refers to the human spirit, at least we may say that it sometimes refers to the human spirit. (Nee 1992b, pp. 229–31, italic added)

Under the influence⁴⁰ of the CUV's dichotomous approach in translating *pneuma* and *psuche*, except for a few Chinese Christian leaders such as Jia (1949, p. 116), Watchman Nee, and Witness Lee and those who followed their teachings on trichotomy, Chinese Christians over the last century (or even the last two centuries) are generally unaware of the distinction between *pneuma* and *psuche* in the New Testament and unaware of the theological tradition of trichotomy. Thus, more than Christianity in the West, those holding the teachings of trichotomy in Chinese Christianity are often misunderstood and fiercely opposed by the dichotomists, for they could not see trichotomy possibly being a biblical teaching based on the Chinese Bible(s) they read, which do not seem to lend much support to the doctrine. This might explain why sharp critiques and even questionable claims have been directed against trichotomists (Yu 2018, pp. 218–27; Liu 2020; Yu 2008, p. 96 ff), and the issue of dichotomy versus trichotomy has continued to be a source of controversy in Chinese Christianity.

The issue of dichotomy versus trichotomy certainly has also influenced Chinese Christians' understanding of many other important theological issues, such as the humanity of Christ (was Christ dichotomous or trichotomous?), the believers' relationship with Christ and the Holy Spirit (in what way are the believers in union with Christ, in soul or spirit?), the way of salvation (in what sense are the believers saved—in their soul, spirit, or body?), and the nature of the church as the body of Christ (in what sense is the church the body of Christ?). Besides these, dichotomy and trichotomy have also resulted in different views on man's fall, regeneration, *ordo salutis*, sanctification, glorification, and afterlife (Yu 2008, pp. 57–95), as well as the nature of Christian life and work. For example, as dichotomists generally do not distinguish between soul and spirit, they typically do not distinguish between that which is from the soul and that which is from the spirit. As a result, dichotomists tend to evaluate a believer's living and work by whether they meet certain moral or doctrinal standards, whereas trichotomists would judge by whether they are from and by the spirit (that is, from and by God, because trichotomists generally believe that God is dwelling in the believer's spirit), as Watchman Nee, a trichotomist, wrote:

All the work that God calls us to do is revealed in the intuition of the spirit (see Section Five, Chapter One). When a believer acts according to the thoughts of the mind, the activities of the emotion, and the ambitions of the will, he goes outside of the will of God. Only that which is born of the Spirit is spirit; all the other things are not. All of a believer's work must only come from receiving revelation in the spirit after trusting and waiting upon God; otherwise, the flesh will come in . . . Every work which is done for God is *not* necessarily the work of God. Doing something for Him is not enough. The real question is who is doing it? If God Himself does not work from the spirit of the believer, and there is only the activity of a believer using his own strength, then the work cannot count before God. (Nee 1992b, pp. 259, 261)

These contrasting views on Christian life and work have naturally resulted in different kinds of churches and works in Chinese Christianity. Moreover, some scholars have suggested that one's belief in dichotomy or trichotomy may influence one's view toward law, government, and politics (Wang and Hsieh 2011): for example, those who are dichotomists and embrace the Reformed tradition tend to be more politically active, as

⁴⁰ This paper does not suggest that all Chinese Christians who hold a dichotomous view of human constitution do so *only* or even *mainly* because of the dichotomous influence of the CUV. It only suggests that the CUV has exerted an influence on Chinese Christianity in this matter, but there are surely also other factors such as the common dichotomous view of man already existing in the Chinese culture.

exemplified by the Presbyterian churches in Taiwan and the Reformed churches in China⁴¹, and those who are trichotomists tend to stay away from politics and see the nature and commission of the church as solely spiritual, as exemplified by the churches that follow the teachings of Watchman Nee (Nee 1993; Pitts 2014; Kärkkäinen 2021, p. 129). All these suggested influences and correlations surely deserve further research in order to deepen our understanding of both the history and the current state of Chinese Christianity.

The CUV's translation of *pneuma* and *psuche* is surely not the only case in which a certain theological influence from the missionary translators may be detected and examined. Other examples include the CUV's translation of Greek words such as προφητεύω (to prophesy) (cf. Menzies 2010, pp. 12–24), ζωή (life), λόγος (word), ἐκκλησία (church), βασιλεία (kingdom), οὐρανός (heaven), βάπτισμα (baptism), αἵρεσις (heresy), μενό (abide), and ποιμήν (shepherd), and many theologically charged passages. As translators are called “the first-line doers of theology” (Noss 2002, p. 333), it behooves us to examine how Western theological traditions have influenced the development of Chinese Christianity through the missionaries' translation of these theological terms and passages in the CUV and earlier Chinese Bible versions.

5. Conclusions

In conclusion, this paper showed that the Reformed theological tradition and specifically its dominant dichotomous view on human constitution have likely influenced the rendering of *pneuma* and *psuche* in four 19th-century Chinese Bible translations including the CUV, and this in turn has exerted a lasting influence on Chinese Christianity to this day. Commenting on the recent trend of China-centered studies on Chinese Christianity, Lian Xi wrote that this “redirecting of the spotlight to indigenous Chinese Christians should not deter us, however, from recognizing the basic historical chain of events in the rise of Chinese Christianity,” and “Western missionaries, as carriers of the Gospel and initiators of China's encounter with Christianity, must be granted their critical role in the making of that movement” (Lian 2017, p. 32). Echoing Lian's remark, this paper hopes to have shown that the examination of the influences of the theology of the Western missionaries on Chinese Christianity through Bible translation is not only an underexplored research field worthy of further investigation but also a necessary missing piece of the jigsaw puzzle that when discovered will help us see a more complete picture of Chinese Christianity both past and present.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: Data is contained within the article.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

⁴¹ The Presbyterian churches in Taiwan for decades have been actively involved with the Taiwan independence movement (Wang and Hsieh 2011, pp. 312–13), and the Reformed churches in China have similarly been more politically active than other non-Reformed churches (Chow 2018, pp. 92–114).

Appendix A. The Translation of *pneuma* (Spirit) from Acts to Revelation

	M (1813/1823)	DV (1852)	PV (1872)	CUV (1919)	CRV (1987)	KJV/RV
Acts 7:59	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	<i>shen</i> 神 (spirit)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
Acts 17:16	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
Acts 18:25	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>zhi</i> 志 (will)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
Acts 19:21	<i>shenfeng</i> 神風 (Holy Spirit)	omitted	omitted	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
Acts 20:22	<i>feng</i> 風 (Spirit)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
Rom. 1:9	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xinling</i> 心靈 (mind, heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
Rom. 2:29	<i>feng</i> 風 (Spirit)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
Rom. 7:6	<i>feng</i> 風 (Spirit)	<i>shengshen</i> 聖神 (Holy Spirit)	<i>shengling</i> 聖靈 (Holy Spirit)	<i>xinling</i> 心靈 (mind, heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
Rom. 8:4	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>shengshen</i> 聖神 (Holy Spirit)	<i>shengling</i> 聖靈 (Holy Spirit)	<i>shengling</i> 聖靈 (Holy Spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	Spirit/spirit
Rom. 8:5-6	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>shen</i> 神 (spirit)	<i>shengling</i> 聖靈 (Holy Spirit)	<i>shengling</i> 聖靈 (Holy Spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	Spirit/spirit
Rom. 8:9-10	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>shen</i> 神 (spirit)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>xinling</i> 心靈 (mind, heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	Spirit/spirit
Rom. 8:15-16	<i>feng</i> 風 (Spirit)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
Rom. 11:8	<i>feng</i> 風 (Spirit)	omitted	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
Rom. 12:11	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>zhi</i> 志 (will)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
1 Cor. 2:11	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>shen</i> 神 (spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
1 Cor. 4:21	<i>feng</i> 風 (Spirit)	<i>yi</i> 意 (manner)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
1 Cor. 5:3-4	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>shen</i> 神 (spirit)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
1 Cor. 5:5	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
1 Cor. 7:34	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>shen</i> 神 (spirit)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
1 Cor. 14:2	<i>feng</i> 風 (Spirit)	<i>shen</i> 神 (spirit)	<i>shengling</i> 聖靈 (Holy Spirit)	<i>xinling</i> 心靈 (mind, heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
1 Cor. 14:14-16	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
1 Cor. 14:32	<i>feng</i> 風 (Spirit)	<i>shen</i> 神 (spirit)	<i>xingling</i> 性靈 (disposition)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
1 Cor. 16:18	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
2 Cor. 2:13	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
2 Cor. 4:13	<i>feng</i> 風 (Spirit)	omitted	omitted	omitted	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
2 Cor. 7:1	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>wuxing</i> 無形 (invisible)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
2 Cor. 7:13	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>shen</i> 神 (spirit)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
2 Cor. 12:18	<i>feng</i> 風 (Spirit)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xinling</i> 心靈 (mind, heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit/Spirit
Gal. 6:1	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
Gal. 6:18	<i>shen</i> 神 (spirit)	<i>xinzhì</i> 心志 (will)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
Eph. 1:17	<i>shengshen</i> 聖神 (Holy Spirit)	<i>shen</i> 神 (spirit)	<i>shengling</i> 聖靈 (Holy Spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit

	M (1813/1823)	DV (1852)	PV (1872)	CUV (1919)	CRV (1987)	KJV/RV
Eph. 3:5	<i>shengshen</i> 聖神 (Holy Spirit)	<i>shengshen</i> 聖神 (Holy Spirit)	<i>shengling</i> 聖靈 (Holy Spirit)	<i>shengling</i> 聖靈 (Holy Spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	Spirit
Eph. 4:23	<i>feng</i> 風 (Spirit)	<i>shen</i> 神 (spirit)	<i>qi</i> 氣 (breath)	<i>zhi</i> 志 (will)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
Eph. 6:18	<i>feng</i> 風 (Spirit)	omitted	<i>shengling</i> 聖靈 (Holy Spirit)	<i>shengling</i> 聖靈 (Holy Spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	Spirit
Phil. 1:27	<i>feng</i> 風 (Spirit)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xinzhi</i> 心志 (will)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
Phil. 2:1	<i>feng</i> 風 (Spirit)	<i>shen</i> 神 (spirit)	<i>shengling</i> 聖靈 (Holy Spirit)	<i>shengling</i> 聖靈 (Holy Spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	Spirit
Phil. 4:23	N/A ⁴²	N/A	N/A	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	N/A/spirit
Col. 2:5	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>shen</i> 神 (spirit)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
1 Thes. 5:23	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>shen</i> 神 (spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
2 Tim. 1:7	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
2 Tim. 4:22	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	omitted	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
Philem. 25	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xinzhi</i> 心志 (will)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
Heb. 4:12	<i>shen</i> 神 (spirit)	<i>shen</i> 神 (spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
Heb. 12:9	<i>lingshen</i> 靈神 (intelligent spirit)	<i>shen</i> 神 (spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
Heb. 12:23	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>shen</i> 神 (spirit)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
James 2:26	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	<i>shen</i> 神 (spirit)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
1 Pet. 3:4	<i>pingqi</i> 品氣 (disposition)	<i>shen</i> 神 (spirit)	<i>xingqing</i> 性情 (disposition)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
1 Pet. 4:6	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>shen</i> 神 (spirit)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>lingxing</i> 靈性 (intelligence, spirituality)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit
Jude 19	<i>shengfeng</i> 聖風 (Holy Spirit)	<i>shengshen</i> 聖神 (Holy Spirit)	<i>shengling</i> 聖靈 (Holy Spirit)	<i>shengling</i> 聖靈 (Holy Spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	Spirit
Rev. 1:10	<i>shenfeng</i> 神風 (Holy Spirit)	<i>shengshen</i> 聖神 (Holy Spirit)	<i>shengling</i> 聖靈 (Holy Spirit)	<i>shengling</i> 聖靈 (Holy Spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	Spirit
Rev. 4:2	<i>shenfeng</i> 神 風 (Holy Spirit)	<i>shengshen</i> 聖神 (Holy Spirit)	<i>shengling</i> 聖靈 (Holy Spirit)	<i>shengling</i> 聖靈 (Holy Spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit/Spirit
Rev. 17:3	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	<i>shengshen</i> 聖神 (Holy Spirit)	<i>shengling</i> 聖靈 (Holy Spirit)	<i>shengling</i> 聖靈 (Holy Spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit/Spirit
Rev. 21:10	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	<i>shengshen</i> 聖神 (Holy Spirit)	<i>shengling</i> 聖靈 (Holy Spirit)	<i>shengling</i> 聖靈 (Holy Spirit)	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	spirit/Spirit

⁴² NA means that in the Greek base text of these translations the Greek word *pneuma* was not used.

Appendix B. The Translation of *psuche* (Soul) in the New Testament

	M (1823)	DV (1852)	PV (1872)	CUV (1919)	CRV (1987)	KJV/RV
Matt. 10:28	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	soul
Matt. 11:29	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	soul
Matt. 22:37	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>xing</i> 性 (disposition)	<i>xing</i> 性 (disposition)	<i>xing</i> 性 (disposition)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	soul
Matt. 26:38	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	soul
Mark 12:30	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>xing</i> 性 (disposition)	<i>xing</i> 性 (disposition)	<i>xing</i> 性 (disposition)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	soul
Mark 14:34	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	soul
Luke 1:46	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	soul
Luke 2:35	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	soul
Luke 10:27	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>xing</i> 性 (disposition)	<i>xing</i> 性 (disposition)	<i>xing</i> 性 (disposition)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	soul
Luke 12:19-20	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	omitted/ <i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)/ <i>linghun</i> 靈魂	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	soul
Luke 21:19	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>shengming</i> 生命 (life) or <i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul) or <i>shengming</i> 生命 (life)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	soul
John 12:27	<i>lingshen</i> 靈神 (intelligent spirit)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	soul
Acts 2:27	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	soul
Acts 4:32	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	<i>zhi</i> 志 (will)	<i>yi</i> 意 (desire)	<i>yi</i> 意 (desire)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	soul
Acts 14:22	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	soul
Acts 20:10	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	<i>qi</i> 氣 (breath)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	life
1 Cor. 15:45	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	<i>ren</i> 人 (man)	<i>ren</i> 人 (man)	<i>yolingde</i> 有靈的 (having spirit) (or <i>yoxieqide</i> 有血氣的 [natural]) <i>ren</i> 人 (man)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	soul/being
Phil. 1:27	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>yi</i> 意 (desire)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	mind/soul
1 Thes. 5:23	<i>feng</i> 風 (spirit)	<i>qi</i> 氣 (breath)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	soul
Heb. 4:12	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	<i>qi</i> 氣 (breath)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	soul
Heb. 6:19	<i>ling</i> 靈 (spirit)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	soul
Heb. 10:39	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	omitted	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	soul
Heb. 13:17	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	soul
James 1:21	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	soul
James 5:20	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	omitted	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	soul
1 Pet. 1:9	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	soul
1 Pet. 1:22	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>lingfu</i> 靈府 (spiritual residence)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>xin</i> 心 (heart)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	soul
1 Pet. 2:11	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>linghun</i> 靈魂 (soul)	<i>hun</i> 魂 (soul)	soul

	M (1823)	DV (1852)	PV (1872)	CUV (1919)	CRV (1987)	KJV/RV
1 Pet. 2:25	linghun 靈魂 (soul)	omitted	linghun 靈魂 (soul)	linghun 靈魂 (soul)	hun 魂 (soul)	soul
1 Pet. 4:19	ling 靈 (spirit)	hun 魂 (soul)	linghun 靈魂 (soul)	linghun 靈魂 (soul)	hun 魂 (soul)	soul
2 Pet. 2:8	linghun 靈魂 (soul)	omitted	xin 心 (heart)	xin 心 (heart)	hun 魂 (soul)	soul
3 John 2	lingshen 靈神 (intelligent spirit)	hun 魂 (soul)	xin 心 (heart)	linghun 靈魂 (soul)	hun 魂 (soul)	soul
Rev. 6:9	linghun 靈魂 (soul)	hun 魂 (soul)	linghun 靈魂 (soul)	linghun 靈魂 (soul)	hun 魂 (soul)	soul
Rev. 18:14	xin 心 (heart)	omitted	omitted	omitted	hun 魂 (soul)	soul
Rev. 20:4	linghun 靈魂 (soul)	omitted	linghun 靈魂 (soul)	linghun 靈魂 (soul)	hun 魂 (soul)	soul

Appendix C. The Translation of *pneumatikos* (Spiritual) and *psuchikos* (Soulish) in the New Testament

<i>pneumatikos</i> (spiritual)						
	M (1823)	DV (1852)	PV (1872)	CUV (1919)	CRV (1987)	KJV/RV
1 Cor. 2:15	ling 靈 (spiritual)	shengshen 聖神 (of the Holy Spirit)	shushenglingde 屬聖靈的 (of the Holy Spirit)	shulingde 屬靈的 (spiritual)	shulingde 屬靈的 (spiritual)	spiritual
1 Cor. 3:1	ling 靈 (spiritual)	shengshen 聖神 (of the Holy Spirit)	shushenglingde 屬聖靈的 (of the Holy Spirit)	shulingde 屬靈的 (spiritual)	shulingde 屬靈的 (spiritual)	spiritual
1 Cor. 14:37	shengshen 聖神 (of the Holy Spirit)	shen 神 (of the Spirit)	bei shushengling gandongde 被聖靈感動 (moved by the Holy Spirit)	shulingde 屬靈的 (spiritual)	shulingde 屬靈的 (spiritual)	spiritual
1 Cor. 15:44	ling 靈 (spiritual)	shenling 神靈 (spiritual)	lingxingde 靈性的 (of spiritual nature)	lingxingde 靈性的 (of spiritual nature)	shulingde 屬靈的 (spiritual)	spiritual
1 Cor. 15:46	shulingzhe 屬靈者 (spiritual)	shen 神 (spiritual)	shulingde 屬靈的 (spiritual)	shulingde 屬靈的 (spiritual)	shulingde 屬靈的 (spiritual)	spiritual
Gal. 6:1	shen 神 (spiritual)	ganyushen 感於神 (moved by the Spirit)	bei shengling gandongde 被聖靈感動 (moved by the Holy Spirit)	shulingde 屬靈的 (spiritual)	shulingde 屬靈的 (spiritual)	spiritual
<i>psuchikos</i> (soulish)						
1 Cor. 2:14	chu 畜 (brute)	weihua 未化 (uncivilized)	shuqingyude 屬情欲的 (of the lust)	shuxieqide 屬血氣的 (of natural impulse)	shuhunde 屬魂的 (soulish)	natural
1 Cor. 15:44	chu 畜 (brute)	xieqi 血氣 (natural)	xieqide 血氣的 (natural)/	xieqide 血氣的 (natural)/	shuhunde 屬魂的 (soulish)	natural
1 Cor. 15:46	shuchu 屬畜 (brute)	xieqi 血氣 (natural)	shuxieqide 屬血氣的 (natural)	shuxieqide 屬血氣的 (natural)	shuhunde 屬魂的 (soulish)	natural
James 3:15	yu 欲 (lust)	xieqisuoji 血氣所激 (driven by natural impulse)	shuqingyude 屬情欲的 (of the lust)	shuqingyude 屬情欲的 (of the lust)	shuhun 屬魂 (soulish)	sensual
Jude 19	shurouyu 屬肉欲 (of fleshly lust)	omitted	zhirenzhexieqi 只任著血氣 (only act by natural impulse)	shuhuxieqi 屬乎血氣 (of natural impulse)	shuhun 屬魂 (soulish)	sensual/worldly

References

- American Tract Society. 1906. *Eighty-First Annual Report of the American Tract Society*. New York: American Tract Society.
- Baller, Frederick William. 1907a. *An Analytical Vocabulary of the New Testament*, 2nd ed. Shanghai: China Inland Mission and American Presbyterian Mission Press.
- Baller, Frederick William. 1907b. Notes on the Revision of the Mandarin New Testament. *The Chinese Recorder and Missionary Journal* 38: 22–31, ff.
- Bates, Miner Searle. 1974. The Theology of American Missionaries in China, 1900–1950. In *The Missionary Enterprise in China and America*. Edited by John King Fairbank. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, pp. 135–58.
- Bays, Daniel H. 1996. *Christianity in China: From the Eighteenth Century to the Present*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Blumczynski, Piotr. 2006. *Doctrine in Translation: The Doctrine of the Trinity and Modern English Versions of the New Testament*. Pruszków: Oficyna Wydawnicza LEKSEM.
- Chan, Clara Ho Yan. 2017. The Translation of ‘spirit’ and ‘Soul’ in the Mandarin Bible Union Version. *Translation and Interpreting* 9: 87–99. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Chong, Yau. 2000. *A Study of the Phenomenon of Authoritativeness in the Chinese Translations of the Protestant Bible*. Hong Kong: International Bible Society (H.K.).
- Chow, Alexander. 2018. *Chinese Public Theology: Generational Shifts and Confucian Imagination in Chinese Christianity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Daily, Christopher A. 2013. *Robert Morrison and the Protestant Plan for China*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Eber, Irene. 1999. Interminable Term Question. In *Bible in Modern China: The Literary and Intellectual Impact*. Edited by Irene Eber, Sze-kar Wan, Knut Wolf and Roman Malek. Sankt Augustin: Institut Monumenta Serica, pp. 135–61.
- Ellicott, Charles John, ed. 1897. *A New Testament Commentary for English Readers*. London, Paris and Melbourne: Cassell, vol. III.
- Erickson, Millard J. 2013. *Christian Theology*, 3rd ed. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic.
- Hykes, John. 1892. Meeting of the Board of Revisers. *The Chinese Recorder and Missionary Journal* 23: 25–28.
- James, Janice. 2011. Establishing An English Bible in Henry VIII’s England: Translation, Vernacular Theology, and William Tyndale. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of York, York, UK.
- Jia, Yuming. 1949. *完全救法 [Total Salvation]*. Hangzhou: Zhejiang Provincial Christian Council.
- Kaiser, Andrew. 2019. *Encountering China*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- Kärkkäinen, Veli-Matti. 2021. *An Introduction to Ecclesiology: Revised and Expanded, Historical, Global, and Interreligious Perspectives*. Downers Grove: IVP Academic.
- Legge, James. 1852. *The Notions of the Chinese Concerning God and Spirits: With An Examination of the Defense of an Essay, on the Proper Rendering of the Words Elohim and Theos, into the Chinese Language*. Hong Kong: “Hongkong Register” Office.
- Leung, Beatrice Kit Fun. 2010. The Missionaries. In *Handbook of Christianity in China, II: 1800–Present*. Leiden: Brill, pp. 793–809.
- Leung, Philip Yuen-Sang. 2011. Mission History Versus Church History: The Case of China Historiography. In *Enlarging the Story: Perspectives on Writing World Christian History*. Edited by Wilbert R. Shenk. Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, pp. 54–74.
- Lian, Xi. 1997. *The Conversion of Missionaries: Liberalism in American Protestant Missions in China, 1907–1932*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Lian, Xi. 2017. Missionaries in the Making of Vernacular Christianity in China. In *Shaping Christianity in Greater China: Indigenous Christians in Focus*. Edited by Paul Woods. Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, pp. 27–40.
- Liu, Chao-Chun. 2020. Translating *Nephesh* in the Psalms into Chinese: An Exercise in Intergenerational and Literary Bible Translation. *Religious Studies Review* 46: 553.
- Lünemann, Gottlieb. 1884. *Critical and Exegetical Handbook of the Epistles of St. Paul to The Thessalonians*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Mak, George Kam Wah. 2010. *The British and Foreign Bible Society and the Translation of the Mandarin Chinese Union Version*. Hong Kong: Christian Study Centre on Chinese Religion and Culture.
- Mak, George Kam Wah. 2020. The Mandarin Union Version, a Classic Chinese Biblical Translation. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 30: 7–19. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Mateer, Calvin. 1901. The Meaning of the Word 神. *The Chinese Recorder and Missionary Journal* 32: 61–72.
- Mateer, Calvin. 1902. The Meaning of the Word 神. *The Chinese Recorder and Missionary Journal* 33: 71–79.
- Menzies, Robert. 2010. *The Language of the Spirit: Interpreting and Translating Charismatic Terms*. Cleveland: CPT Press.
- Morrison, Robert. 1815a. *A Dictionary of the Chinese Language, In Three Parts. Vol. I—Part I*. Macao: East India Company’s Press.
- Morrison, Robert. 1815b. *A Dictionary of the Chinese Language, In Three Parts. Vol. I—Part II*. Macao: East India Company’s Press.
- Nee, Watchman. 1992a. *The Collected Works of Watchman Nee, Set One, Volume 12: The Spiritual Man (1)*. Anaheim: Living Stream Ministry.
- Nee, Watchman. 1992b. *The Collected Works of Watchman Nee, Set One, Volume 13: The Spiritual Man (2)*. Anaheim: Living Stream Ministry.
- Nee, Watchman. 1993. *The Collected Works of Watchman Nee, Set Two, Volume 34: The Glorious Church*. Anaheim: Living Stream Ministry.
- Ng, Peter Tze Ming. 2012. From ‘Christianity in China’ to ‘Chinese Christianity’: Changing Paradigms and Changing Perspectives. In *Chinese Christianity: An Interplay between Global and Local Perspectives*. Leiden: Brill, pp. 19–42.
- Noss, Philip A. 2002. Translators’ Words and Theological Readings. *The Bible Translator* 53: 331–43. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Ogden, Graham S. 2002. Translation as a Theologizing Task. *The Bible Translator* 53: 308–16. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

- Palmer, Edwin, ed. 1881. *The Greek New Testament with the Readings Adopted by the Revisers of the Authorized Version*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Parker, Alvin Pierson, Henry Varnum Noyes, William Muirhead, Hampden Coit DuBouse, Carl Johannes Voskamp, and John Ross. 1899. *The Conference Commentary on the New Testament*. Shanghai: Huamei Bookstore (華美書館).
- Parker, Alvin Pierson, John Ross, Henry Varnum Noyes, and Hampden Coit DuBouse. 1907. *The Conference Commentary on the New Testament*. Hankow and Shanghai: The Religious Tract Society for China.
- Pitts, Joseph R. 2014. Watchman Nee and Witness Lee. In *Congressional Record Vol. 160, No. 62*. Available online: <https://www.congress.gov/congressional-record/2014/4/29/extensions-of-remarks-section/article/E621-3> (accessed on 15 January 2021).
- Scrivener, Frederick Henry Ambrose, ed. 1882. *The Parallel New Testament Greek and English: The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ Being the Authorised Version Set Forth in 1611 Arranged in Parallel Columns with the Revised Version of 1881 and with the Original Greek*. Cambridge: The University Press.
- Strandenaes, Thor. 1987. *Principles of Chinese Bible Translation as Expressed in Five Selected Versions of the New Testament and Exemplified by Mt. 5:1-12 and Col. 1*. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wikesell International.
- Strandenaes, Thor. 2006. Anonymous Bible Translators: Native Literati and the Translation of the Bible into Chinese 1807–1907. In *Sowing the Word: The Cultural Impact of the British and Foreign Bible Society 1804–2004*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, pp. 121–48.
- Stuart, John Leighton. 1918. *Greek-Chinese-English Dictionary of the New Testament*. Shanghai: Presbyterian Mission Press.
- Thayer, Joseph Henry, ed. 1889. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Being Grimm's Wilke's Clavis Novi Testamenti*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Tong, Clement. 2018. *Revelation and Text—Story of the Chinese*. Hong Kong: Tien Dao Publishing House Ltd., Bible (1807–1919).
- Tong, Clement. 2019. A Translation or A Revision? The Mandarin Union Version and Its Use of the Chinese Base Texts. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 30: 1–18. [CrossRef]
- Walf, Knut. 1999. Christian Theologoumena in Western Translations of the Daoists. In *Bible in Modern China: The Literary and Intellectual Impact*. Edited by Irene Eber, Sze-kar Wan and Knut Walf. Sankt Augustin: Institut Monumenta Serica, pp. 123–34.
- Wang, Shengtai, and Renshou Hsieh. 2011. 基督教人倫的發展與爭議，對基督教派政治觀的影響 [The Development and Controversy of Christian Anthropology, and Their Influences on Various Christian Groups' Views on Politics]. In *No Death, No Life—2011 Symposium on Modern Chinese Christian Theology*. Edited by Shih-Hao Lin and Fu-Chu Chou. New Taipei City: CCLM Publishing Group Ltd., pp. 298–318.
- Wendland, Ernst R. 2002. 'Theologizing' in Bible Translation with Special Reference to Study Notes in Chichewa. *The Bible Translator* 53: 316–30. [CrossRef]
- Wigram, Christopher E. M. 2007. *The Bible and Mission in Faith Perspective: J. Hudson Taylor and the Early China Inland Mission*. Zoetermeer: Uitgeverij Boekencentrum.
- Woodbridge, Samuel Isett. 1898. The Conference Commentary. *The Chinese Recorder and Missionary Journal* 29: 354–55.
- Yao, Kevin. 2003. *The Fundamentalist Movement among Protestant Missionaries in China, 1920–1937*. Dallas: University Press of America.
- Ying, Fuk-tsang. 2005. 近代中國基督教史的研究趨向—以美國及臺灣地區為例 [The Research Trends on Modern History of Chinese Christianity—Taking the US and Taiwan as Examples]. *International Sinology* 12: 200–22.
- You, Bin. 2007. The Forgotten Bible Translators: Chinese Literati and Chinese Bible Translation. *LOGOS & PNEUMA Chinese Journal of Theology* 27: 227–47.
- Yu, Zhong-lun. 2008. *What Is Man—A Comparison Between the Dichotomous and Trichotomous Views of Man*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Truth Book Room.
- Yu, Hui Er. 2018. *Translating Nephesh in the Psalms into Chinese*. Carlisle: Langham Monographs.
- Zetzsche, Jost Oliver. 1999. *The Bible in China: The History of the Union Version or the Culmination of Protestant Missionary Bible Translation in China*. Sankt Augustin: Institut Monumenta Serica.
- Zetzsche, Jost Oliver. 2000. The Missionary and the Chinese 'Helper': A Re-Appraisal of the Chinese Role in the Case of Bible Translation in China. *Journal of the History of Christianity in Modern China* 3: 5–20.